

16th April 1960] [Sri N. K. Palanisami]

Party opposed it and came out of the Party. Thus there is a split in the party and I want to know whether this information has been carried to you

MR. SPEAKER : I am afraid I am not aware of anything that the hon. Member is saying. It may be so but I am not aware of any split or reduction in the strength of the members of the Main Opposition Party. At the present moment the strength of their members is equal to the quorum that is necessary for the House. I therefore recognize the hon. Member, Sri V. K. Ramaswamy Mudaliyar, as the hon. the Leader of the Main Opposition. But if at any stage I come to know that the strength of his party is diminished, I hope the hon. the Leader of the Opposition will tell me about it—then the hon. Member Sri V. K. Ramaswamy Mudaliyar will become the leader of one of the Opposition Parties instead of being the Leader of the Main Opposition. Therefore, there is no point of order and I cannot come to the rescue of the hon. Member, Sri Palanisami.

V.—GOVERNMENT BILLS.

(1) THE MADRAS ANATOMY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1960.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Sir, I beg leave to introduce the Madras Anatomy (Amendment) Bill, ^a 1960.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

‘That leave be granted for the introduction of the Madras Anatomy (Amendment) Bill, 1960.’

The motion was put and carried and leave was granted.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Sir, I introduce the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER : The Bill is introduced.

(2) THE MADRAS CORNEAL GRAFTING BILL, 1960.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Sir, I beg leave to introduce the Madras Corneal Grafting Bill, ^a 1960.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

‘That leave be granted for the introduction of the Madras Corneal Grafting Bill, 1960.’

The motion was put and carried and leave was granted.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Sir, I introduce the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER : The Bill is introduced.

(3) THE MADRAS JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS (REGULATION OF REPORTS) BILL, 1960.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Sir, I beg leave to introduce the Madras Judicial Proceedings (Regulation of Reports) Bill, 1960.

^a Published in the *Fort St. George Gazette Extraordinary*, dated 16th April 1960.

[16th April 1960]

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

‘That leave be granted for the introduction of the Madras Judicial Proceedings (Regulation of Reports) Bill, 1960.’

The motion was put and carried and leave was granted.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER : The Bill is introduced.

(4) THE MADRAS MINING LEASES (ACQUISITION OF RIGHTS) BILL, 1960.

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Sir, I beg leave to introduce the Madras Mining Leases (Acquisition of Rights) Bill, ^ 1960

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

‘That leave be granted for the introduction of the Madras Mining Leases (Acquisition of Rights) Bill, 1960’.

The motion was put and carried and leave was granted.

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER : The Bill is introduced.

(5) THE MADRAS LAND REFORMS (FIXATION OF CEILING ON LAND) BILL, 1960 (L.A. BILL NO. 8 OF 1960)—cont.

9-30
a.m.

SRI M. WILLIAM: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I welcome this Bill. I feel it is really a beneficent reform. Of course, it is quite in keeping with the goal of socialism to which this Government have committed themselves. Though Bills of this type are new to India, in western countries, probably with the exception of the United States of America and Great Britain, ever since the first world war, expropriation of lands by proper legislative measures has been effected. So far as Great Britain is concerned, the tenants' position was so very secure that they never clamoured for any agrarian reform. The landlords also considered themselves as gentlemen farmers, and they never wanted to harass the tenants. They were satisfied with the prestige and the social status of owning large extents of land. So much so, nothing can be said now that this Bill is a reactionary one. So far as this Bill is concerned, I can boldly say that it is more liberal in its character than the Bills that have been initiated in other States. We find that 30 standard acres have been fixed as the ceiling. So far as Kerala is concerned, 15 acres of double crop lands are fixed as the ceiling. So far as Orissa is concerned, 25 acres are fixed as the ceiling. In Mysore, they have fixed three family holdings as the ceiling on the calculation that each family holding must yield a net income of Rs. 1,200. So the total comes to Rs. 3,600 per year. On the basis of net income, they have fixed the ceiling at Rs. 3,600. Most of the other States have adopted thirty standard acres as the ceiling. In regard to Andhra Pradesh, we find that they have taken a net income of Rs. 5,000 as the ceiling.